

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Initially, Applicant would like to express his appreciation to the Examiner for the detailed Official Action provided. Applicant also notes with appreciation Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's Information Disclosure Statement filed in the present application by the return of the initialed and signed PTO-1449 form and the Examiner's acknowledgment of Applicant's claim for priority and receipt of the certified copies of the priority documents in the Official Action. Applicant further gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of the allowability of claims 2-9 and 12-20.

Upon entry of the present paper, claims 1 and 8 will have been amended to clarify the claim language therein and to render the same consistent throughout the claims (as discussed *supra*) and claims 10-18 will have been added, with claims 1-9 remaining pending for consideration by the Examiner. Applicant notes that newly-added claims 10-18 generally respectively correspond to original claims 1-9, and further recite a digital camera having, *inter alia*, a body. In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of all the claims pending in the present application. Such action is respectfully requested and is now believed to be appropriate.

Turning to the merits of the action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-3 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication US 2002-0135898 to NOMURA (commonly-assigned to Applicant's Assignee), finding that this reference teaches all limitations of these claims.

As discussed *supra*, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection. Applicant

submits that NOMURA, as well as the other references of record, are markedly different from the present claimed invention. Specifically, as discussed supra, NOMURA fails to teach or suggest at least the claimed feature that rotation of said pair of rotatable rings is transmitted to said driven rotational member, as claimed in independent claim 1 (and newly-added independent claim 10). Rather, in NOMURA, only one rotatable ring 15 of the pair of rotatable rings 15, 31 transmits rotation to a driven member 18 or 19. For example, as described, *inter alia*, at col. 17, line 61 - col. 18, line 64 of NOMURA, the other rotatable ring 31 (barrier drive ring) is engaged by the cam ring 15 in the accommodation position, and when the cam ring rotates in this position, the rotatable ring 31 is rotated by the cam ring to close the barrier blades 42, which are normally biased in the open position by a spring 45. Thus, the barrier drive ring 31 *does not* transmit rotation to a driven rotation member (identified by the Examiner as first lens group moving frame 18 or second lens moving frame 19). To the contrary, in the present claimed invention, the pair of rotatable rings (for example, third external barrel 15 and helicoid ring 18) rotate together and *both* transmit rotation to the driven member (for example, cam ring 11).

It is therefore respectfully submitted that NOMURA, as well as the other references of record, fails to teach or suggest the invention of independent claim 1 (or of newly-added independent claim 10), as well as the claims dependent therefrom.

With respect to the Examiner's rejection of dependent claims 2-3 and 6, since these claims are dependent from allowable independent claim 1, which is allowable for at least the reasons discussed supra, these dependent claims are also allowable for at least these reasons. Further, all dependent claims (including newly-added dependent claims 11-18) recite additional features which

P23684.A04

further define the present invention over the references of record. It is thus respectfully submitted that all rejected claims are patentably distinct from the references of record.

Absent a disclosure in a single reference of each and every element recited in a claim, a prima facie case of anticipation cannot be made under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Since the applied reference fails to disclose each and every element recited in independent claim 1, and the claims dependent therefrom, these claims are not anticipated thereby. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every pending claim of the present application meets the requirements for patentability under 35 U.S.C. §102, and respectfully requests the Examiner to indicate the allowance of each and every pending claim in the present application.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the present paper is in proper form and that none of the references either taken together or taken alone in any proper combination thereof, anticipates or renders obvious Applicant's invention. Accordingly, consideration of the present Response, reconsideration of the outstanding Official Action and allowance of the present application and all of the claims therein are respectfully requested and are now believed to be appropriate.

With respect to Applicant's amendment of claims 1 and 8, Applicant submits that these Amendments have not been made for a purpose related to patentability, but rather are clarifying amendments that are cosmetic in nature that are not intended to narrow the scope of the claims. Accordingly, this amendment should not be considered a decision by Applicant to narrow the claims in any way.

Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
Hiroshi NOMURA

William S. Boshnick
Reg. No. 44,550

Bruce H. Bernstein
Reg. No. 29,027

January 24, 2005
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
(703) 716-1191

STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Applicant wishes to express his appreciation to Examiner Gray for the interview of January 18, 2005. During the interview, Applicant's representative, Attorney William Boshnick, spoke to the Examiner concerning the rejected claims of the present invention. Specifically, Attorney Boshnick showed a model of an embodiment of the present claimed invention, and demonstrated how the reference failed to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in rejected claims 1-3 and 6. It was suggested that the last limitation of claim 1, namely, ". . . configured to transmit rotation of said rotatable ring to said driven rotational member" was somewhat unclear, since it was unclear as to whether "said rotatable ring" referred to one or both rotatable rings. Attorney Boshnick suggested that this limitation of claim 1 be amended to recite "configured to transmit rotation of said pair of rotatable ring rings to said driven rotational member" to clarify this arrangement, and then pointed out that the applied NOMURA 2002/0135898 publication failed to teach or suggest this limitation. The Examiner agreed that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest at least this feature as claimed in independent claim 1. However, the Examiner indicated that he would conduct an updated search before making a final decision on allowance.